THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

Vol. I.] BOSTON, MARCH, 1860. [No. 3.

PROF. HUNTINGTON'S ARGUMENT FOR THE TRINITY.

We propose to examine in this number of our Journal, at some length, the late sermon of Dr. Huntington, in which he gives his reasons for accepting the Doctrine of the Trinity. The title of the sermon is, "Life, Salvation, and Comfort for Man in the Divine Trinity."

When one, who has for twenty years been our companion and friend in preaching the great doctrines of Liberal Christianity, changes his convictions, and leaves us, it would be idle to deny that we feel deep sorrow at his loss. When, as in the present case, he is one of our able ministers, the sorrow is proportionally greater. But, beside this, Dr. Huntington is a man whom we love and esteem for his manliness, earnestness, and Christian fidelity. We shall speak with perfect plainness of the defects in his argument; we shall point out the weakness of his logic; we shall show the root of what we believe to be the great error of his life. But, meantime, we shall try to say all this as we should say it to himself alone.

We believe that "a man can do nothing against the truth," and that all of Prof. Huntington's efforts and abilities are worse than wasted in defending the church doctrine of the Trinity. If our doctrine is of God, we shall prevail, though all the great men of our body prove apostate. We shall march prospering, though not by their presence. Let them leave us one by one; let them go where the church is larger, and there is a greater tide of religious sympathy; let them leave our little flock for the great folds. We have a certain compensation for their loss, — a sense of satisfaction in feeling that no foundation is touched, and that our convictions are proved to stand, not in the power of man, but in that of God. There is a double feeling, a complex sentiment; sorrow like that which Jesus felt when many went back, and walked no more with him; but joy like that which led him to bless God that he had hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes. As, when Leonidas dismissed from his ranks all but the three hundred, those who were left felt that they could depend on each other; so we, when men whose affinities are only half with the cause of a free and advancing theology retire, can close up our ranks with a certain joy that those at least who remain, and who stand these tests, are surely reliable.

There is no need, then, for apology in examining his sermon, however searching that examination may prove. This is what Dr. Huntington himself must wish. He writes and prints for this purpose, — that we may examine, and thoroughly examine, what he says. But, in order to do this work, it seems most proper to begin by asking why Unitarians reject the doctrine of the Trinity; then we can inquire whether Dr. Huntington has adduced satisfactory answers to these objections, and whether he has brought forward any new statement of the doctrine,

or arguments in support of it, which invalidate the Unitarian criticisms of the church doctrine.

Our course of argument, therefore, will be, —

I. Briefly to recount the reasons which have induced Unitarians to reject the Trinity.

II. To see if Dr. Huntington has replied to these reasons.

III. To examine the positions he has taken, and the arguments by which he supports that position.

The principal reasons, then, for rejecting the Trinity, as assigned by Unitarians, are these: —

1. That it is nowhere taught in the New Testament.

2. That every statement of the Trinity, which has ever been made, has been either (1) self-contradictory; (2) unintelligible; (3) Tritheistic; (4) or Unitarian, in the form of Sabellianism or of Arianism.

3. That the arguments for it are inadequate.

4. That the arguments against it are overwhelming.

5. That the good ascribed to it does not belong to it, but to the truths which underlie it.

6. That great evils to the church come from it.

7. That it is a doctrine of philosophy, and not of faith.

8. That we can trace its gradual historic formation in the Christian Church.

9. That it is opposed to a belief in the real Divinity of Christ, and to a belief in his real humanity; thus undermining continually the faith of the church in the Divine Humanity of Christ Jesus the Lord.

Proceeding, then, to an examination of these reasons, we say, —

I. The church doctrine of the Trinity is nowhere stated in the New Testament.

To prove this, as it is a negative proposition, would require us to go through the whole New Testament. But we are saved this necessity by the fact, that we have a statement on this point from one of Dr. Huntington's own witnesses, and one on whom he mainly relies. He brings forward NEANDER, the great church-historian, as a believer in the Trinity (page 361), and again (page 378), by an error which he has since candidly admitted, quotes him as saying, "It is the fundamental article of the Christian faith," — which is just what he denies in the following passage. We call Neander to the stand, however, *now*, to have his unimpeachable testimony as a Trinitarian (and a Trinitarian claimed by Dr. Huntington with pride) to the fact, that the doctrine of the Trinity is nowhere stated in the New Testament. This is what Neander says of the Trinity, in the first volume of his great work on Church History (p. 572, Torrey's translation): —

"We now proceed to the doctrine in which Theism, taken in its connection with the proper and fundamental essence of Christianity or with the doctrine of redemption, finds its ultimate completion, — *the doctrine of the Trinity.* This doctrine does not strictly belong to the fundamental articles of the Christian faith; as appears sufficiently evident from the fact, that *it is expressly held forth in no one particular passage of the New Testament:* for the only one in which it is done, the passage relating to the three that bear record (1 John v. 7), is undoubtedly spurious, and, in its ungenuine shape, testifies to the fact, how foreign such a collocation is from the style of the New-Testament Scriptures. We find in the New Testament no other fundamental article than that of which the Apostle Paul says, that other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, — the annunciation of Jesus as the Messiah."

With this authority we might be content. But Dr. Huntington seems to differ from Neander in thinking that Jesus has himself stated the doctrine of the Trinity, and

stated it clearly and fully, in the baptismal formula (Matt. xxviii. 19). He seems to say that this is "a clear and full declaration of the fundamental article of Christian belief." He says, "Now, if ever, Christ will distinctly pro claim the doctrine of Christendom;" and he then declares that Christ, in this passage, told his church to baptize "in the Triune name."

Not in the Tri*une* name, certainly. This is an assumption of our friend. He may think that this is implied; that this is to be inferred; that this is what Christ meant: but certainly it is not what Christ said. Christ gives us here *three* objects of baptism, no doubt; but he does not say that they are one. How far this baptismal formula is "a clear and full declaration" of the doctrine of the Trinity will appear thus. The doctrine of the Trinity declares, —

1. That the Father is God.
2. That the Son is God.
3. That the Holy Ghost is God.
4. That the Holy Ghost is a person, like the Father and the Son.
5. That these three persons constitute one God.

Of these five propositions, all of which are essential to the doctrine of the Trinity, *not one is stated in the baptismal formula.* Christ here says *nothing* about the Deity of the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost; *nothing* about the personality of either of them; and *nothing* about their Unity. It is difficult to conceive, therefore, how Dr. Huntington can bring himself to call this a command to baptize into the Triune name. We will not refer to his own explanation of Unitarian criticisms, and say, "How desperate the shifts of a determined theory!" because we do not think such an insinuation just or kind. If he chooses to say that his old friends resort to desperate shifts to maintain their theories, because they do not choose to be convinced,

he may say so of us: we will not say that of him. Such insinuations, however, we trust, dropped from him in the haste and heat of writing. We do not believe that he intended either bitterness or severity.

Dr. Huntington adds, "Our faith is summoned to the three persons of the one God." But nothing is said of three *persons;* nothing is said of their being one God.

He says, "No hint is given that there is any difference of nature, dignity, duration, power, or glory, between them."

We admit it, but also say that no hint is given of any *equality* of nature, dignity, duration, power, or glory, between them. Which way, then, is the argument? Christ does not state, on the one hand, that the three are unequal or different: he does not state, on the other hand, that they are equal and the same. The inference of proof from this fact seems to us to be this: If the apostles, when Christ spoke to them, were already full believers in the church doctrine of the Trinity, the fact that Christ did not deny it would be an argument in its favor; but if the apostles were, at that time, wholly ignorant of the Trinity, then the fact, that he did not assert it distinctly, at least shows that he did not mean to teach it at that time. That inference appears to us a very modest one. But Dr. Huntington will admit that they did not know the doctrine; for he tells us that it was the purpose of Christ to teach it to them at that time. To which we can only reply, If he meant to teach the doctrine, why did he not teach it?

That the *word* TRINITY is not to be found in the New Testament, and that it was invented by Tertullian, is a matter of little consequence; but that the doctrine itself should be nowhere stated in the New Testament, we conceive to be a matter of very great consequence. We have seen that Dr. Huntington's attempt to show that it *is* stated

in the baptismal formula is a failure. If not stated there, we presume that he will not maintain that it is stated anywhere. We therefore agree with Neander in saying, that, whether the doctrine be true or not, it is not taught distinctly in the New Testament. If taught at all, it is only taught inferentially; that is, it is a matter of reasoning, not a matter of faith. It is metaphysics: it is not religion.

II. The second reason why Unitarians reject the church doctrine of the Trinity is this: —

That every statement of the Trinity has proved, on examination, to be either (1) a contradiction in terms, or (2) unintelligible, or (3) Tritheistic, or (4) Unitarianism under a Trinitarian form.

Let us examine this objection. What is the general statement of the Trinity, as made by the Orthodox Church, Catholic and Protestant? Fortunately, this question is easily answered.

Orthodoxy has been consistent since the middle ages in its general statement, however much it may have varied in its explanations of what it meant by that statement.

The doctrine of the Trinity, as it stands in the creeds of the churches, is this: —

There is in the nature of God three persons, — the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one being. They are the same in substance, equal in power and glory. Each of these three persons is very God, infinite in all attributes; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God.

According to the general doctrine of Orthodoxy, the unity of God is in being, essence, and substance; that is, God is one being, God is one essence, God is one substance. The threefold division stops short of the being of God: it does not penetrate to his essential nature; it does not divide his substance.

What, then, is the Trinity? It is a Trinity of persons.

But what is meant by "person," as used in this doctrine? According to the common and familiar use of the word at the present time, three persons are three beings. Personality expresses the most individual existence imaginable. If, therefore, the word "person" is to be taken according to the common use of the phrase, the doctrine of the Trinity would be evidently a contradiction in terms. It would be equivalent to saying, God is one being, but God is three beings; which again would be equivalent to saying that one is three.

Now, Trinitarians generally are too acute and clear-sighted to fall into such a palpable contradiction as this. It is a common accusation against them, that they believe one to be three, and three one; but this charge is, in most cases, unjust. This would be only true in case they affirmed that God is three in the same way in which he is one; but they do not usually say this. They declare that he is one being, — not three beings. They declare that the threefold distinction relates to personality, not to being; and that they use the word "person," not in the common sense, but in a peculiar sense, to express, as well as they can, a distinction, which, from the poverty of language, no word can be found to express exactly. Thus St. Augustine confessed, long ago, "We say that there are three persons, not in order to say any thing, but in order not to be wholly silent." *Non ut aliquid diceretur, sed ut ne taceretur.* And so Archbishop Whately, in the notes to his Logic, regrets that the word "person" should ever have been used by our divines; and says, "If *hypostasis*, or any other completely foreign word, had been used instead, no idea at all would have been conveyed, except that of the explanation given; and thus the danger, at least, of being misled by a word, would have been avoided."

(1) *The Unintelligible Statement.*

The Trinitarian thus avoids asking us to believe a contradiction: but, in avoiding this, he runs upon another rock, — that, namely, of not asking us to believe any thing at all; for if "person" here does *not* mean what it commonly means, and if it be impossible, from the poverty of language, to define precisely the idea which is intended by it, we are then asked to believe a proposition which Trinitarians themselves are unable to express. But a proposition which is not expressed is no proposition. A proposition, any important term of which is unintelligible, is wholly unintelligible.

To make this matter clear, let us put it into a conversational form. We will suppose that two persons meet together, — one a Unitarian, the other a Trinitarian.

Trinitarian. You do not believe the Trinity? Then you cannot be saved. No one can be saved who denies the Trinity. It is a vital and fundamental doctrine.

Unitarian. Tell me what it is, and I will see if I can believe it. What is the Trinity?

Trin. God exists as one being, but three persons.

Unit. What do you mean by "person"? Do you mean a person like Peter, James, or John?

Trin. No: we use "person" from the poverty of language. We do not mean that.

Unit. What, then, do you mean by it?

Trin. It is a mystery. We cannot understand it precisely.

Unit. I have no objection to the doctrine being mysterious; I believe a great many things which are mysterious: but I don't want the *language* to be mysterious. You might as well use a Greek or a Hebrew or a Chinese word, and ask me to believe that there are three *hypostases*

or three *prosopa* in Deity, if you do not tell me what you mean by the word "person."

Trin. It is a great mystery. It is a matter of *faith*, not of *reasoning*. You must believe it, and not speculate about it.

Unit. Believe *it?* Believe *what?* I am waiting for you to tell me what I am to believe. I am ready to exercise my faith; but you are tasking, not my faith, but my knowledge of language. I suppose that you do not wish me to believe *words*, but thoughts. I wish to look through the word, and see what thought lies behind it.

Now, it seems to us that this is a very fair demand of the Unitarian. To ask us to believe a proposition, any important term of which is unintelligible, is precisely equivalent to asking us to believe no proposition at all. Let us listen to Paul: "Even things without life, giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For, if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for battle? So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, — how shall it be known what is spoken? *for ye shall speak into the air.* . . . For, if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a Barbarian; and he that speaketh, a Barbarian unto me."

It is of no use to talk about mystery in order to excuse ourselves for not using intelligible language. That which is *mysterious* is one thing: that which is *unintelligible* is quite another thing. We may understand what a mystery is, though we cannot comprehend *how* it is; but that which is unintelligible we neither comprehend nor understand at all. We neither know *how* it is nor *what* it is. Thus, for example, the fact of God's foreknowledge and man's freedom is a mystery. I cannot comprehend how God can

foreknow what I am to do to-morrow, and yet I be free to do it or not do it. I cannot comprehend how Jesus should be delivered to death by the determined counsel and foreknowledge of God, and yet the Jews have been free agents in crucifying him, and accountable for it. These things are mysteries; but they are not unintelligible as doctrines. I see what is meant by them. There is no obscurity in the assertion, that God foreknows every thing; nor in the other assertion, that man is a free agent. I can see clearly what is implied *in both statements*, although my mind cannot grasp both, and bring them together, and show the way in which they may be reconciled. So, too, infinity is a mystery. We cannot comprehend it. Our mind cannot go round it, grasp it, sustain it. Our thought sinks baffled before the attempt to penetrate to the depth of such a wonderful idea. But we understand well enough what is meant by infinity. There is nothing obscure in *the statement* of the fact, that the universe is unbounded. So the way in which a flower grows from its seed is mysterious. We cannot comprehend how the wonderful principle of life can be wrapped up in those little folds, and how it can cause the root to strike downward, and the airy stalk to spring lightly upward, and the leaves to unfold, and, last of all, the bright, consummate flower to open its many-colored eye. But certainly we can understand very well *the statement* that a flower grows, though we do not comprehend how it grows.

Do not, then, tell us, when you have announced a doctrine, the language of which is unintelligible, that you have told us a mystery. You have done no such thing. Your proposition is not mysterious: it is unintelligible. It is not a mystery: it is only a mystification.

(2) *The Tritheistic Statement.*

Leaving, then, this ground of mystery, and attempting to define more clearly what he means by three persons and one substance, the Trinitarian often sinks the Unity in the Triplicity, and so runs ashore upon Tritheism. This happens when he explains the term "person" as implying independent existence; in which case the Unity is changed into Union. Then we have really three Gods: the FATHER, who devises the plan of redemption; the SON, who goes forth to execute it; and the HOLY SPIRIT, who sanctifies believers. If there are these three distinct beings, they can be called one God only as they are one in will, in aim, in purpose, — only as they agree perfectly on all points. The Unity of God, then, becomes only a unity of agreement, not a unity of being. This is evidently not the Unity which is taught in the Bible, where Jesus declares that the *first of all the commandments is*, "Hear, O Israel! the Lord our God is ONE Lord."

Moreover, against such a Trinity as this there are insuperable objections, from grounds of reason as well as of Scripture. For God is the Supreme Being, the Most High; and how can there be *three* Supreme Beings, three Most High Gods? Again: God is the first cause; but if the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are each God, and all equal in power and majesty, and have each an independent existence, then there are three first causes; which is evidently impossible. Again: one of the attributes of God is his independent or absolute existence. A being who depends on another cannot be the Supreme God. The Father, Son, and Spirit, therefore, cannot depend on each other; for each, by depending on another, would cease to be the independent God. But, if they do not depend on each other, then each ceases to be God, who is the First Cause:

for that being is not the first cause who has two other beings independent of him. Other arguments of the same kind might be adduced to show that there cannot be three necessary beings. In fact, all the arguments from reason, which go to prove the Unity of God, prove a unity of nature, not of agreement.

"But why argue against Tritheism?" you may say. "Are any Tritheists?" Yes: many Trinitarians are in reality Tritheists, by their own account of themselves. There are many who make the *Unity* of God a mere unity of agreement, and talk about the *society* in the Godhead, and the *intercourse* between the Father, Son, and Spirit.*

2. Opposed to this kind of Trinity is another view, in which the Unity is preserved, but the Trinity lost. According to this view, God is one Being, who reveals himself in three ways, — as Father, as Son, as Spirit, — or sustains three relations, or manifests himself in three modes of operation. The Trinity here becomes a nominal thing, and is, in reality, only Unitarianism with an Orthodox

* Dr. Horace Bushnell, a favorite authority with Prof. Huntington, whom Prof. Huntington quotes largely, and whose views he earnestly recommends, gives us his testimony to this point, thus ("God in Christ," pp. 130, 131):—

"A very large portion of Christian teachers, together with the general mass of disciples, undoubtedly hold three real living persons in the interior nature of God; that is, three consciousnesses, wills, hearts, understandings."

"*A very large portion of Christian teachers*" hold, then, to a belief in three Gods; and with them is joined "*the general mass of the disciples.*" The only Unity held by these teachers is, he goes on to say, "a social Unity." Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are, in their view, socially united only; and preside in that way, as a kind of celestial Tritheocracy, over the world. This heresy, he says, "because of its clear opposition to Unitarianism, is counted safe, and never treated as a heresy." That is, the Christian Church allows the belief in *three Gods*, and will not discipline those who hold that opinion; but, if you believe strictly and only in *one God*, you cannot be saved!

name. This kind of Trinity also is very prevalent, and is the one really maintained by men of high standing in the Orthodox Church, both in Europe and America. According to this view, the word "person" in the doctrine of the Trinity means the same as the corresponding word in Greek and Latin formerly meant; namely, the outward character, not the inward individuality. Thus Cicero says, "I, being one, sustain three persons or characters; my own, that of my client, and that of the judge," — *Ego unus, sustineo tres personas.*

This view of the Trinity is commonly called Modalism, or Sabellianism; and is also widely held by those who call themselves Trinitarians. It is, in fact, only Unitarianism under a Trinitarian name.*

(3) *The Subordination View.*

3. Avoiding these two extremes, and yet wishing to retain a distinct idea of Unity and Tripersonality, the Trinitarian is necessarily driven upon a third view, in which the Father is the only really Supreme and Independent Being, the Son and the Holy Spirit subordinate and dependent.

* Dr. Bushnell goes on to say (p. 133), "While the Unity is thus confused and lost in the threeness, perhaps I should admit that the threeness sometimes appears to be clouded or obscured by the Unity. Thus it is sometimes protested, that in the word 'person' nothing is meant beyond a threefold distinction; though it will always be observed, that nothing is really meant by the protestation; that the protester goes on to speak and to reason of the three, not as being only somewhats or distinctions, but as metaphysical and real persons. . . . Indeed, it is a somewhat curious fact in theology, that the class of teachers who protest over the word 'person,' declaring that they mean only a *threefold distinction*, cannot show that there is really a hair's breadth of difference between their doctrine and the doctrine asserted by many of the later Unitarians."

This view, which is called the subordination scheme, or Arianism, is Unitarianism again in another form; and this view also is entertained by many who still retain the name of "Trinitarians." According to this view, the Son and the Holy Ghost are really God, but are so by a derived divinity. God the Father communicates his divinity to the Son and the Holy Ghost. This is the view really taken in the Nicene Creed, though adopted in opposition to the Arians; and was the doctrine of the earliest Church Fathers before the Arian controversy began. In the Nicene Creed, we read that the Son is "God of (ἐκ) God, Light of (ἐκ) Light, true God of true God;" the "*of*" here being the same as "from," and denoting origin and derivation.

This doctrine seems, in reality, to have less in its favor than either of the others. By calling the Son and Holy Spirit God, it contrives to make three distinct Gods, and so is Tritheism; and yet, by making them dependent on the Father, it becomes Unitarianism again. Thus, singularly enough, this attempt at making a compromise between Unity and Trinity loses both Unity and Trinity: for it makes three Gods, and so loses the Unity; and yet it makes Christ not "God over all," not the Supreme Being, and so loses the Trinity.

Between these different views, between Tritheism, Sabellianism, and Arianism, the Orthodox Trinity has always swung to and fro, — inclining more to one or to the other, according to the state of controversy in any particular age. When the Arian or Tritheistic views were proclaimed and defended, the Orthodoxy of the church swung over towards Sabellianism, making the Unity strong and solid; and the Trinity became a thin mode or an airy abstraction. When Sabellianism, thus encouraged, came openly forward, and defended its system and won adherents, then church Orthodoxy would hasten to set up barriers on that side, and

would fall back upon Tritheistic ground, making the Threefold Personality a profound and real distinction, penetrating the very nature of Deity, and changing the Unity of Being into a mere Unity of Will or agreement. We will venture to say, that there has never yet been a definition of the Trinity which has not been either Tritheistic or Modalistic; and church Orthodoxy has always stood either on Tritheistic or on Sabellian ground. In other words, the Orthodox Trinity of any age, when searched to the bottom, has proved to be Unitarianism after all. — Unitarianism in the Tritheistic or in the Sabellian disguise: for the Tritheism of three co-equal, independent, and absolute Gods, is too much opposed both to reason and Scripture to be able ever to maintain itself openly as a theology for any length of time.

The analogies which are used to explain the Trinity are all either Sabellian or Tritheistic. Nature has been searched in all ages for these analogies, by which to make the Trinity plain; but none have ever been found which did not make the Trinity either Sabellianism or Tritheism. They are either three parts of the substance, or else three qualities or modes of the substance.

Thus we have instances in which the three are made the three parts of one being, or substance; as in *man*, — spirit, soul, body; thought, affection, will; head, heart, hand.

One Being with three distinct faculties is Tritheism: one Being acting in three directions is Sabellianism.

Time is past, present, and future. Syllogism has its major, minor, and conclusion. There are other like analogies.

St. Patrick took for his illustration the three leaves of trefoil, or clover. Others have imagined the Trinity like a triangle; or they have referred to the three qualities of space, — height, breadth, width; or of fire, — form, light,

and heat; or of a noun, which has its masculine, feminine, and neuter; or of a government, consisting of king, lords, and commons; or of executive, legislative, and judiciary.

This survey of church Trinity shows that it is either one in which, —

1. The persons are not defined; or an unintelligible Trinity.

2. Or which defines person and Unity in the usual sense; or a contradictory Trinity.

3. Or which defines person as usual, and the Unity as only Union; or Tritheism.

4. Or which defines person as only manifestation; or Sabellianism.

These four are all the views ever hitherto given, and are all untenable. We might stop here, and say that the Trinity is utterly unsupported. There is no need of going to the Scripture to see if it is taught there; for we have, as yet, nothing to look for in Scripture.

The Trinitarian's difficulty appears to be in defining person. But possibly he may say, "I cannot, indeed, give a positive idea of person; but I can give a *negative* one. I cannot say what it *is;* but I can say what it is *not.* It is *not* a mere *mode* on the one hand; and not *being,* on the other. We must neither confound the persons nor divide the substance."

We will, then, go further, and say, as Trinitarians have never yet defined person, without making it either a mode or a being, so they never can define it otherwise. There is no third between being and mode. They *must* either confound the persons or divide the substance.

Again: that which differences one person in the Deity from another must be either a perfection or an imperfection. There is nothing between these. But it cannot be an imperfection; for no imperfection exists in God: and it

cannot be a perfection: for then the other two persons would want a divine perfection, and would be imperfect.

III. The arguments in support of the Trinity are wholly inadequate. Since, according to NEANDER, the Trinity is not stated in the New Testament, it follows that it is a doctrine of *inference* only: that is, a piece of human reasoning. Now, we have, no doubt, a perfect right to infer doctrines from Scripture which are not stated there: but, as Protestants, we have no right to make these inferences fundamental, or essential to the religious life. They may, indeed, be metaphysically essential: that is, essential to a well-arranged system: but they are not morally essential; that is, not essential to the moral and spiritual life of the soul.

But this is just what Prof. Huntington attempts to do. He tries to show that there is a doctrine essential to the life, peace, and progress of man, which the New Testament has omitted to state; which is neither distinctly stated by our Saviour nor by any of his apostles; which has been left to be inferred, and inferred by the mere processes of unaided human reason.

What arguments does he allege for this?

His first and principal argument is the *universal belief of the Christian Church in the doctrine of the Trinity.*

On this, Prof. Huntington lays great stress. He says, —

"Truth is not determined by majorities; and yet it would be contrary to the laws of our constitution not to be affected by a testimony so vast, uniform, and sacred as that which is rendered by the common belief of Christian history and the Christian countries to the truth of the Trinity. There is something extremely painful, not to say irreverent, towards the Providence which has watched and led the true Christian Israel, in presuming that a tenet so emphatically and gladly received in all the ages

and regions of Christendom, as almost literally to meet the terms of the test of Vincentius, — believed always, everywhere, and by all, — is unfounded in revelation and truth. Such a conclusion puts an aspect of uncertainty over the mind of the church, scarcely consistent with any tolerable confidence in that great promise of the Master, that he would be with his own all days" (p. 359).

To which we answer, —

(1) That, according to Dr. Bushnell (Mr. Huntington's own witness), there never has been, nor is now, any such belief in the doctrine of the Trinity as he asserts. The largest part of the church have always "divided the substance" of the Deity, and another large portion have "confounded the persons;" and so the majority of the church, while holding the word "Trinity," have never believed in the Tri-unity at all.

Prof. Huntington summons Dr. Bushnell as a witness to the practical value of the Trinity; and we may suppose something such an examination as this to take place: —

Prof. Huntington. Tell us, Dr. Bushnell, what instances you know of persons who have been converted or deeply blessed by the holy doctrine of the Trinity.

Dr. Bushnell. I have known of "a great cloud of witnesses," "living myriads," "who have been raised to a participation of God in the faith of this adorable mystery" (Huntington, p. 413).

Prof. H. Mention some of them.

Dr. B. "Francis Junius," "two centuries and a half ago," — a professor "at Heidelberg, (Leyden?) testified that he was, in fact, converted from atheism by the Christian Trinity;" also "the mild and sober Howe;" "Jeremy Taylor;" also "the Marquis de Rentz," "Edwards," and "Lady Maxwell" (Huntington, p. 414).

Unitarian. Say, Dr. Bushnell, whether, in your opin-

ion, the majority of Christians really believe in the church doctrine of the Trinity.

Dr. B. "A very large portion of the Christian teachers, together with the general mass of disciples, undoubtedly hold three living persons in the interior nature of God" (Bushnell: "God in Christ," p. 130).

Unit. Is that scriptural or Orthodox?

Dr. B. No. It is only "a social Unity." It is "a celestial Tritheocracy." It "boldly renounces Orthodoxy at the point opposite to Unitarianism" (Bushnell: "God in Christ," p. 131).

Unit. Do I understand you to be now speaking of the properly Orthodox ministers and churches generally?

Dr. B. "Our properly Orthodox teachers and churches, while professing three persons, also retain the verbal profession of one person. They suppose themselves really to hold that God is one person: and yet they most certainly do not; they only confuse their understanding, and call their confusion faith. This I affirm on the ground of sufficient evidence; partly because it cannot be otherwise, and partly because it visibly is not" (*ibid.*, p. 131).

Unit. Do you believe, Dr. Bushnell, that spiritual good can come from such a belief in the Trinity as you describe to be "undoubtedly" that of "the general mass of disciples"?

Dr. B. "Mournful evidence will be found that a confused and painfully bewildered state is often produced by it. They are practically at work in their thoughts to choose between the three; sometimes actually and decidedly preferring one to another; doubting how to adjust their mind in worship; uncertain, after, which of the three to obey; turning away, possibly, from one with a feeling of dread that might well be called aversion; devoting them-

selves to another as the Romanist to his patron saint. This, in fact, is Polytheism, and not the clear, simple love of God. There is true love in it, doubtless; but the comfort of love is not here. The mind is involved in a dismal confusion, which we cannot think of without the sincerest pity. No soul can truly rest in God, when God is in two or three, and these in such a sense that a choice between them must be continually suggested" (*ibid.*, p. 134).

Unit. This state of mind is that of undoubtedly the general mass of the disciples?

Dr. B. It is (*ibid.*, p. 130).

Unit. Are there others, calling themselves Trinitarians, who hold essentially the Unitarian doctrine?

Dr. B. Yes. "It is a somewhat curious fact in theology, that the class of teachers who protest over the word 'person,' declaring that they mean only a *threefold distinction*, cannot show that there is really a hair's breadth of difference between their doctrine and the doctrine asserted by many of the later Unitarians. They may teach or preach in a very different manner; they probably do: but the theoretic contents of their opinion cannot be distinguished. Thus, they say that there is a certain divine person in the man Jesus Christ; but that, when they use the term 'person,' they mean, not a person, but a certain indefinite and indefinable distinction. The later Unitarians, meantime, are found asserting that God is present in Christ in a mysterious and peculiar communication of his being; so that he is the living embodiment and express image of God. If, now, the question be raised, 'Wherein does the indefinable *distinction* of one differ from the mysterious and peculiar *communication* of the other?' or 'How does it appear that there is any difference?' there is no living man, I am quite sure, who can invent an answer" (*ibid.*, p. 135).

Unit. Is it not true that both of these views are sometimes held alternately by Trinitarians?

Dr. B. "Probably there is a degree of alternation, or inclining from one side to the other, in this view of Trinity, as the mind struggles, now to embrace one, and now the other, of two incompatible notions. Some persons are more habitually inclined to hold the three; a very much smaller number, to hold the one" (*ibid.*, p. 134).

Unit. But can they not hold the Unity with this Trinity?

Dr. B. "No man can assert three persons, meaning three consciousnesses, wills, and understandings, and still have any intelligent meaning in his mind, when he asserts that they are yet one person. For, as he now uses the term, the very idea of a person is that of an essential, incommunicable monad, bounded by consciousness, and vitalized by self-active will; which being true, he might as well profess to hold that three units are yet one unit. When he does it, his words will, of necessity, be only substitutes for sense" (*ibid.*, p. 131).

(2) But suppose that the belief of the church in the Trinity was as universal as Prof. Huntington asserts and Dr. Bushnell denies, what would be its value? His argument proves too much. If it proves the Trinity to be true, it proves, *à fortiori*, the Roman-Catholic Church to be the true church, and Protestantism to be an error; for Martin Luther, at one time, was the only Protestant in the world. Suppose that a Roman priest had come to him then. He might have addressed him thus: —

"It is certainly an impressive testimony to the truth of the church of Rome, that the Christian world have been so generally agreed in it. Truth is not determined by majorities; and yet it would be contrary to the laws of our constitution not to be affected by a testimony so vast, uniform, and sacred as that which is rendered by the common belief of Christian history and the Christian centuries to

the doctrines and practices of the Roman-Catholic Church. We travel abroad, through these converted lands, over the round world. We enter, at the call of the sabbath morning light, the place of assembled worshippers; let it be the newly planted conventicle on the edge of the Western forest, or the missionary station at the extremity of the Eastern continent; let it be the collection of Northern mountaineers, or of the dwellers in Southern valleys; let it be in the plain village meeting-house, or in the magnificent cathedrals of the old cities; let it be the crowded congregation of the metropolis, or the 'two or three' that meet in faith in upper chambers, in log huts, or under palm-trees; let it be regenerate bands gathered to pray in the islands of the ocean, or thankful circles of believers confessing their dependence and beseeching pardon on ships' decks, in the midst of the ocean. So we pass over the outstretched countries of both hemispheres; and it is well nigh certain — so certain that the rare and scattered exceptions drop out of the broad and general conclusion — that the lowly petitions, the fervent supplications, the hearty confessions, the eager thanksgivings, or the grand peals of choral adoration, which our ears will hear, will be uttered according to the grand ritual of the church of Rome. This is the voice of the unhesitating praise that embraces and hallows the globe."

What would Luther have replied to that? He would have said, "Truth must have a beginning. It is always, at first, in a minority. The gate of it is strait, the path to it narrow, and few find it. All reforms are, at the beginning, in the hands of a small number. If God and truth are on our side, what do we care for your multitudes?" We can make the same answer now.

Prof. Huntington proceeds to give his own creed in regard to the Trinity, — to state his own belief.

God, in himself, he declares, we cannot know at all. We know him only in his revelation. "Out of that ineffable and veiled Godhead — the groundwork, if we may say so, of all divine manifestation; a theocracy — there emerge to us, in revelation, the three whom we rightly call persons, — Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

We can only conceive of God, he says, in action; and in action we behold him as three. But action and revelation take place in time. The Trinity, therefore, according to Prof. Huntington, is only known to us in temporal manifestation: whether it exists in eternity or not, we cannot tell. And yet, in the next sentence, he goes on to say that "the Son is eternally begotten of the Father," and "the Holy Ghost proceeds out of the Father, *not in time:*" which is the very thing he had a moment before professed to know nothing about. It is very difficult, therefore, to tell precisely what his view is. With regard to the incarnation of the Son, he is still more obscure. He says that "Christ comes forth out of the Godhead as the Son;" that he "leaves the glory he had with the Father;" that, while he is on earth, the Father alone represents the unseen personality of the Godhead, and that therefore the Son appears to be dependent on him, and submissive; that temporarily, while the Son is in the world, he remains ignorant of what the Father knows, and says that his Father is greater than he. "He lessens himself to dependency for the sake of mediation." — "All this we might expect." This he calls an "instrumental inequality between Son and Father:" it "is wrought into the biblical language; remains in all our devotional habit, and ought to remain there."

In other words, Prof. Huntington believes that the Infinite God became less than infinite in the incarnation. The common explanation of those passages, where Christ says,

for example, "My Father is greater than I," does not satisfy him. He is not satisfied that Jesus said it "in his human nature:" no. It was the divine nature which said it; and it was really GOD THE SON, who did not know the day nor the hour of his own coming. He lost a part of his omniscience. He ceased to be perfect in all his attributes. We should say, then, that he ceased to be God: but Prof. Huntington maintains that he was God, nevertheless; but God less then omnipotent, — God less than omniscient; God the Son, so distinct from the Father as to be ignorant of what the Father knew, and unable to perform what the Father could do.

Prof. Huntington seems to be aware that some objection may be taken to this view, and so goes on to suggest that all such objections will proceed from an unspiritual nature; and he intimates that no answer nor any criticism will disturb him at all. "I know in whom I have believed" will be reply enough to all objections.

Very well, we say: matters of faith are matters of faith, and to be spiritually discerned; but matters of opinion belong to the intellect, and are to be intellectually discerned. You come to us, Prof. Huntington, your old friends, who think just as you thought yourself, when, a few years since, you gave seven reasons for not believing the Trinity; you come to us, and call on us to believe it. "Believe what?" — "The Trinity." — "Well, what particular view of the Trinity? Tell us what it is." He then proceeds to make his statement: "*This is the* Trinity you are to believe." We produce our objections to his particular view: whereupon he suddenly retires behind a cloud of glowing religious rhetoric, recites to us a passage from the First Corinthians, and tells us plainly that we have no spiritual insight; that we are in danger of "cold and extreme negatives;" that we have "too much con-

scious complacency in our supposed originality;" but that he "knows in whom he has believed."

Prof. Huntington (p. 366) ascribes it to "condescension" in Christ, to say that "of that day and hour knoweth not the Son."—"*It is condescension indeed!*" says he. But this word "condescension" does not well apply here. One does not condescend to be ignorant of what he knows: still less does a truthful person condescend *to say* he is ignorant of what he knows. We may wisely condescend to help the feeble, and sympathize with the lowly, but hardly to be ignorant with them, or to pretend to be ignorant. It is a badly chosen word, and seems to show the vacillation of the writer's thought.

IV. The arguments against the doctrine of the Trinity are unanswerable.

We infer that they are unanswerable from the fact that they are not answered. It is to be presumed that Prof. Huntington, having been for so many years a preacher of Unitarian doctrine, is acquainted with our arguments. It is a remarkable fact, that, in this sermon, he has nowhere attempted to reply to them. He has passed them wholly by. You would not know, from reading the discourse, that he had ever been a Unitarian, or had ever heard of the Unitarian objections to the Trinity; still less that he had himself preached against it. Unitarians, for instance, have said, that *if the Trinity be true, and if it be so important to the welfare of the soul as is contended, it would be somewhere plainly taught in the New Testament.* Does Prof. Huntington answer this argument? No: he answers the argument from the *word* "Trinity" not being in the Bible, and his answer is sufficient; but he does not answer the argument from the fact, that the doctrine itself is not anywhere distinctly taught, and that none of the terms which have

been found essential to any Orthodox statement of the doctrine are to be met with in the New Testament.*

Nor does Prof. Huntington anywhere fairly meet the Unitarian argument from the impossibility of stating the doctrine in intelligible language. He tells us, with his usual eloquence, what we have often enough been told before, that there are many things which we do not understand, and that we must believe many facts the *mode* of which is unintelligible. But when we say, "Can we believe *a doctrine* or proposition which cannot be distinctly stated?" he has no answer. The Trinity is *a doctrine*, and must therefore be distinctly stated in order to be believed. It has not been distinctly stated,† and therefore cannot be believed. To this objection, Prof. Huntington has no reply; and we may conclude that it is an unanswerable objection.

Dr. Huntington uses an unnecessary phrase about those who object to mystery. He calls the objection "shallow self-illusion," and proceeds with the usual declaration, that all of life is mysterious. Can he have been a Unitarian preacher for twenty years, and not have known that Unitarians object to mystery only when it is used by Trinitarians as a cover for obscurity and vagueness of statement?

---

* "It has often been asserted *and admitted*," says Twesten, one of the strongest of modern Trinitarians, "that even the principal notions about which the church doctrine turns are foreign to the New Testament; as *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, *τρόπος ὑπάρξεως* and *ἀποκαλύψεως*, *τριάς* and *ὁμοούσια*" (Twesten: "Dogmatik," vol. ii. p. 281).

† "Who will venture to say that any of the definitions heretofore given of personality in the Godhead, in itself considered, — such definitions as have their basis in the Nicene or Athanasian Creed, — are intelligible and satisfactory to the mind? At least, I can truly say, that I have not been able to find them, if they do in fact exist; nor, so far as I know, has any one been able, by any commentary on them, to make them clear and satisfactory" (Prof. Stuart: "Biblical Repository," April, 1835. See Wilson: "Trin. Test.," p. 272).

You ask us to believe a precise statement; viz., that "there are three *persons* in the Godhead." We say, "What do you mean by 'person'?" The Trinitarian answers, "It is a *mystery*." We say, "We cannot believe it, then." The Trinitarian replies, "Why, all is a mystery. How the grass grows is a mystery; yet you believe it." — "No," we say: "we do not believe it. When the mystery begins, our belief ends: we believe up to that point, and no further." The statement, "the grass grows," is *not* a mystery: the fact, "the grass grows," is *not* a mystery. We believe the fact and the statement. The *way* in which it grows *is* mysterious: and we do not believe any thing about it. "You cannot understand *how* the grass grows." No; and, accordingly, we do not believe any *thing* about *how* the grass grows. But the whole purpose of the Trinity is to show *how* the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit exist. You are not satisfied that we receive *what* the Scripture teaches: you try to show us the *how*, and then leave it in obscurity at last.

Nor does Dr. Huntington reply to the Unitarian explanation of the Trinitarian proof-texts. Trinitarians have often quoted the texts — "*I and my Father are one:*" "*He who has seen me has seen the Father*" — in proof of the Deity of Christ. Unitarians have often replied to both of them: to the first passage, that since Jesus has also said that his disciples were *to be one with him, as he is one with God*, it either proves that the disciples are also to be God, or does *not* prove that Christ is God. To the second passage, Unitarians have replied by reading the next clause, in which Christ says, "Believest thou not that I am *in* the Father?" showing how it is that he reveals the Father. He is *in* the Father, and his disciples are *in* him. Those who see him, see the Father: those who see his true disciples, see the face and image of Christ. These answers are

so obvious, and Prof. Huntington must have heard them so often, that he should, as a controversialist, have taken some notice of them. He has not done so.

He quotes the passage from Eph. i. 20, 21; and says, "*Can this be a creature?*" We reply, "Can he be any thing *but* a creature? — he who was *set* by God in this place of honor. Does God *set* God, as a reward, above principalities and powers? Does God make God "head over all things in the church"? Again: Prof. Huntington quotes, "That, at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that he is Lord;" but he omits the conclusion, "to the glory of God the Father."

He even quotes the passage, "Him *hath God exalted* to give repentance and forgiveness of sin."

And he quotes the passage, which has staggered the strongest believers in the Trinity, where Paul declares (1 Cor. xv.), that, *at the end*, Christ will give up his kingdom to the Father, that "God may be all in all," and explains it as meaning that "he will resume his place in the co-equal Three, the indivisible One." Has he *left* his place, then? Is that Orthodox? Prof. Huntington evidently thinks so; for he says, "The Son, in his character of Sonship, is retaken, so to speak, into the everlasting undivided One." *So to speak.* We may *speak* so: "But what do we mean by it?" is the question. Did God the Son leave his place in the Godhead? did he become less than God? did he become ignorant? did he suffer and die? did he arise, and at last re-ascend, and take his place, "so to speak," in the Godhead? If this is meant as real statement, what better is it than the Avatars of Vishnu? What sort of Unity is left to us? We have a Trinity of council; but where is the Unity, except of agreement? One Divine Being descending, and leaving the other Divine Being alone, temporarily, on the throne of the universe, until

the Divine Being who had descended should re-ascend to take his seat again "in the co-equal Three and indivisible One"!

One Unitarian argument, which appears to us unanswerable, is in the fact, that the very passages in which the highest attributes are ascribed to Christ are always those in which his dependence and subordination are most strongly asserted. We could throw aside all the passages in which Jesus asserts directly his inferiority, — as, "My Father is greater than I;" "Of mine own self I can do nothing," — and take the strongest proof-texts of the Trinitarians, and ask for no better proof for the Unitarian doctrine: "All power is given to me in heaven and earth;" "The image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature;" "In him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Are these passages written of Christ in his divine or human nature? Not his divine nature; for to God the Son all power cannot be "given." God the Son cannot be "the image of God," or the "first-born of every *creature*." The "fulness of the Godhead" cannot dwell in God the Son. They must, then, be said of him in his human nature; and, if so, they show that the loftiest titles and attributes do not prove him to be God.

V. The good ascribed to the doctrine of the Trinity does not belong to it, but to the truths which underlie it.

Dr. Huntington asserts, for example, that "the Tri-unity of God appears to be the necessary means of manifesting and supporting, in the mind of our race, a faith in the true personality of God."

If so, it is remarkable that the two forms of religion in which the personality of God, as absolute will, is most distinctly recognized (i.e., the *Jewish* religion and the *Mohammedan* religion), should both be ignorant of the Trinity.

It is equally remarkable that the most Pantheistic religion in the world, in which the personality of God most entirely disappears (i.e., Braminism), should have a Trinity of its own. It is also remarkable, on this hypothesis, that idolatry in the Christian Church (as worship of Mary, worship of saints and relics, &c.) should come up with the Trinity, and flourish simultaneously with it.

No: it is not the Trinity which brings out most distinctly the personality of God, but the faith in a divine revelation through inspired men. If God can dwell in the souls of men, teaching and guiding them, he must be a person like the soul with which he communes. Especially does the religious consciousness of Jesus, his simple and childlike communion with the heavenly Father, bring God near to the soul as a personal being. It is not the Trinity, but the Christian faith which underlies it, which teaches the divine personality.

Nor is it the doctrine of the Trinity which is necessary for a living faith in God through Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. All that Dr. Huntington says of the evil of sin is well said, but has no bearing on the point before us. According to Prof. Huntington's own witnesses, as we have seen above, the Trinity was unknown in the earlier ages of the church. Was reconciliation unknown? Was the forgiving love of Christ unknown? If he cannot assert this, the doctrine of the Trinity is not necessary to a living faith in a reconciling God.

Prof. Huntington argues, that only the sufferings, and actual sufferings, of God himself, can touch the sinful heart; and, therefore, the Trinity is true. The conclusion is a long way from the premise, even supposing that to be sound. But as regards the premise: he has read and quoted Mansell. Has he not verged toward the dogmatism which that writer condemns? Would it not be more modest,

and better accord with Christian humility, to be satisfied with believing the scriptural assertions, that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son;" that "He who spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all, — shall he not, with him, freely give us all things?" Is not this enough, without an argument to prove that the *only* way by which man can be saved is the method of a suffering God?

We will not dwell further on this head, nor examine our friend's argument to show that we cannot consistently, as Unitarians, have any piety. We will try, then, to have it inconsistently.

VI. Great evils to the church have come from the doctrine of the Trinity.

It has tended to the belief in three Gods. It has tended to a confusion of belief between three Gods of equal power and majesty, united only in counsel; one supreme, and two inferior Deities; one Deity with a threefold manner of manifestation; and a vague, undetermined use of words, with no meaning attached to them; — unhappy confusion, which none have been more ready to recognize and to point out than Trinitarians themselves.

And what shall we say of the continual struggles, conflicts, and bitter controversies, which this doctrine has caused from the time of its entrance into the church? What is there more disgraceful in the history of the church, than the mutual persecutions of Arians and Athanasians, and of all the minor sects and parties, engendered by this disputed doctrine?

This is what Dr. Bushnell says of one of these matters; and his testimony is, perhaps, sufficient on this point: —

"No man can assert three persons, — meaning three consciousnesses, wills, and understandings, — and still have any

intelligent meaning in his mind, when he asserts that they are yet one person; for, as he now uses the term, the very idea of a person is that of an essential, incommunicable monad, bounded by consciousness, and vitalized by self-active will: which being true, he might as well profess to hold that three units are yet one unit. When he does it, his words will, of necessity, be only substitutes for sense.

"At the same time, there are too many signs of the mental confusion I speak of not to believe that it exists. Thus, if the class I speak of were to hear a discourse insisting on the proper personal Unity of God, it would awaken suspicion in their minds, while a discourse insisting on the existence of three persons would be only a certain proof of Orthodoxy; showing that they profess three persons, meaning what they profess, and one person, really not meaning it.

"Such is the confusion produced by attempting to assert a real and metaphysical Trinity of persons in the Divine Nature. Whether the word is taken at its full import, or diminished away to a mere something called a *distinction*, there is produced only contrariety, confusion, practical negation, not light."

So far Dr. Bushnell. On another point, thus testifies Twesten: —

"There are many, to whom the biblical and religious basis of the doctrine is exceeding sure and precious, who are dissatisfied with the church form of the doctrine, and even feel themselves repelled or fettered by it. It is to them more negative than positive; more opposed to errors than giving any insight into truth. It solves no difficulty; it unseals no new revelation."

Twesten goes on to admit that the Trinity has really hemmed in the free movement of the mind, substituting a dead uniformity for a manifold and various life; and yet Twesten is a very strong and able Trinitarian.

VII. The doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine of philosophy, and not of faith.

As philosophy, it might be ever so true and important; but, when brought forward as religion (as Prof. Huntington has done), it would become at once pernicious. To offer theology for religion, belief for faith, philosophy born of speculative reflection in place of spiritual insight and pious experience, have always been most deleterious both to religion and to philosophy.

The objects of faith are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Through Christ, we have access to the Father, in the Spirit. We see the Father revealed to us in the Son; we feel the power of the Spirit in our hearts. This is religion; but this has nothing to do with the doctrine of the Trinity.

VIII. We can trace the gradual formation of the doctrine in the Christian Church.

The following facts we suppose to be incontrovertible: —

1. Down to the time of the synod of Nice (A.D. 325), the Son was considered to be subordinate, or inferior to the Father, by the great majority of writers and teachers in the Christian Church, and by the multitude of believers; and no doctrine of Trinity existed in the church.

2. The *Nicene symbol*, which declared Christ to be "God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, of the same substance with the Father," * was directed against the two Arian positions, — that Christ was created, and that there was a time when he did not exist; but it did not declare his equality with God the Father, nor teach the personality of the Holy Spirit, nor say any thing of the Trinity.

---

* See the creed in Hagenbach ("History of Doct.," vol. i. p. 268): "Θεον ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεον ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ."

3. The councils vacillated to and fro during three hundred years, gradually tending toward the present church doctrine of the Trinity; thus: —

1. *Synod of Nice* (A.D. 325) opposed the Arian doctrine of the creation of Christ out of nothing, and maintained that his substance was derived from that of God.

2. *Synod of Tyre* (A.D. 335) favored the Arians, and deposed Athanasius.

3. *Council of Antioch* (A.D. 343) opposed the views of the Arians, and also the views of their opponents.

4. *Council of Sardica* (A.D. 344) resulted in a division between the Eastern and Western Churches — the East being semi-Arian; and the West, Athanasian — in their view of the nature of Christ.

5. The Western Church tending to Sabellianism (taught by Marcellus and his pupil Photinus), this view was condemned by two councils in the East and West; viz.: —

Second council of Antioch (A.D. 343).

Council of Milan (A.D. 346).

6. Constantius, an Arian emperor, endeavored to make the Western Churches accept the Arian doctrine; and, at two synods (A.D. 353 and 355, at Arelate and Mediolanum), compelled the bishops to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, deposing those who refused to do so.

7. The Arians, being thus dominant, immediately divided into Arians and semi-Arians, — the distinction being the famous distinction between *o* and *oi*. Both parties denied the *Homoousios;* but the semi-Arians admitted the *Homoiousios.*

8. At the synod of Ancyra (A.D. 358), the semi-Arian doctrine was adopted, and the Arian rejected. The third synod of Sirmium (A.D. 358) did the same thing.

9. Down to this time (A.D. 360), nothing was said about the Holy Spirit in its relation to the Trinity. The

Emperor Valens, an Arian, persecuted the Athanasians from A.D. 364 to 378. Then Theodosius, an Athanasian emperor, persecuted the Arians. Semi-Arianism, however, continued Orthodox in the East.

10. The Nestorian controversy broke out A.D. 430. Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) condemned Nestor. The Nestorians (who were Unitarians) separated entirely from the church, and became the church of the Persian Empire.

11. The Monophysite controversy broke out. The council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) decided that there were two natures in Christ; and the Monophysites separated, and formed the Coptic Church. Their formula was, that "God was crucified in Christ." The Nestorians were too Unitarian, and the Monophysites too Athanasian. The church decided (against the Nestorians) that Mary was God's mother, but decided (against the Monophysites) that God was not crucified.

12. *First Lateran Council* was called (in A.D. 640) to settle a new point. It having been decided that there were *two* natures in Christ, it was now thought best by many to yield to the Monophysites, — that there was only one will in Christ. Hence the Monotheletic controversy, finally settled at the, —

13. Sixth General Council (A.D. 680), when *two* wills in Christ were accepted as the doctrine of the church.

Thus it appears that it took the church from A.D. 325 to A.D. 680 to settle the questions concerning the relation of Christ to God. During all this time, opinion vacillated between Arianism on the one hand, and Sabellianism on the other. At the end of this period, the church had become consolidated, and strong enough to compel submission to its opinions: but the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Trinity remained unsettled for several centuries more;

and finally the Eastern Church separated altogether from the Western Church on this point. The whole Greek Church remains, to this day, separated from the Latin Church on a question belonging to this very doctrine of the Trinity. So much, then, for Prof. Huntington's assertion, that the Trinity is a doctrine, which can almost literally be said to have been believed "always, everywhere, and by all."

IX. The doctrine of the Trinity is opposed to the real divinity of Christ and to his real humanity; thus undermining continually the faith of the church in the divine humanity of Jesus Christ the Lord.

Our final and chief objection to the Trinity is, not that it makes Christ divine, but that it does *not* make him so. It substitutes for the divinity of the Father, the Supreme God, which Unitarians believe to dwell in Christ, a subordinate divinity of God the Son. This is subordinate, because derived; and, because derived, dependent. The Son may be said to be "eternally generated;" but this is only an eternal derivation, and does not alter the dependence, but makes it also to be eternal. The tendency of the church doctrine of the Trinity is always to a belief, not in the Supreme Divinity dwelling in Christ, but in a derived and secondary divinity.

How is it, for example, with the Nicene doctrine concerning Christ? Prof. Huntington claims Nice as Trinitarian (p. 361).

But what says Prof. Stuart concerning the Nicene doctrine? Listen:—

"The Nicene symbol presents the Father as the Monas, or proper Godhead, in and of himself exclusively; it represents him as the *Fons et Principium* of the Son, and therefore gives him superior power and glory. It does not even assert the

claims of the blessed Spirit to Godhead; and therefore leaves room to doubt whether it means to recognize a Trinity, or only a Duality" (Moses Stuart: "Bib. Repos.," 1835. Quoted by Wilson: "Trin. Test.," p. 264).

And how is it with the ante-Nicene fathers, whom Prof. Huntington also considers to be Trinitarian, else certainly his rule of "always, everywhere, and by all," does not hold? If, for the first three hundred years after Christ, there were no Trinitarians, it cannot be said that the Trinity has "always" been held in the church. Listen, again, to Prof. Stuart, whose learning no one can question: —

"We find that all the fathers before, at, and after the council of Nice, who harmonize with the sentiments there avowed, declare the Father only to be the self-existent God" (see the whole paragraph in Wilson: "Trin. Test.," p. 267).

"To be the author of the proper substance of the Son and Spirit, according to the Patristical creed; or to be the author of the *modus existendi* of the Son and Spirit, according to the modern creed, — both seem to involve *the idea of power and glory in the Father, immeasurably above that of the Son and Spirit*" (Moses Stuart: "Bib. Repos.," 1835).

So Coleridge asserts that "both Scripture and the Nicene Creed teach a subordination of the Son to the Father, independent of the incarnation of the Son. . . . Christ, speaking of himself as the co-eternal Son, says, 'My Father is greater than I'" (Wilson: "Trin. Test.," p. 270).

According to the Trinitarian doctrine, then, we do not find God — the Supreme God, our heavenly Father — in Christ; but a derived, subordinate, and inferior Deity. Not the one universal Parent do we approach, but some mysterious, derived, inscrutable Deity, less than the Father, and distinct from him. Do we not, then, lose the benefit and blessing of the divinity of Jesus? Can we believe him when he says, "He who has seen me has seen the Father"?

No: we do not believe that, if we are Trinitarians; but rather, that, having seen him, we have seen "THE SON;" whom Coleridge declares to be an inferior Deity; over whom, Bishop Pearson, in his "Exposition of the Creed," says, the Father holds "pre-eminence," — the Father being "the Origin, the Cause, the Author, the Root, the Fountain, the Head, of the Son." The doctrine of the Trinity is therefore opposed, as Swedenborg ably contends, to the real divinity of Christ.*

But it is equally opposed to his real humanity. It constantly drives out of the church the human element in Christ. Prof. Huntington is astonished at Unitarians not perceiving that the humanity of Christ is as dear to Trinitarians as his Deity; yet it cannot be denied, that the mysterious dogma of Deity has quite overshadowed the simple human life of our dear Lord, so that the church has failed to see the Son of man. All his highest human traits become unreal in the light of this doctrine of his Deity. He is tempted: but that is unreal; for God cannot be tempted. He prays, "Our Father:" but this also is no real prayer; for he is omnipotent, and can need nothing. He encounters opposition, hatred, contumely, and bears it with sweetest composure: but what of that? since, as God, he looked down from an infinite height upon the puny opposition. He agonizes in the garden; but it is imaginary suffering:

* Thus speaks Dr. Bushnell on this head ("God in Christ," p. 139): —

"Besides, it is another source of mental confusion, connected with this view of three metaphysical persons, that, though they are all declared to be infinite and equal, they really are not so. The proper deity of Christ is not held in this view. He is begotten, sent, supported, directed, by the Father, in such a sense as really annihilates his Deity. This has been shown in a truly searching and convincing manner by Schleiermacher, in his historical essay on the Trinity; and, indeed, you will see at a glance, that this view of a metaphysical Trinity of persons breaks down in the very point which is commonly regarded as its excellence, — its assertion of the proper Deity of Christ."

how can God feel any real agony like man? Jesus ceases to be example, ceases to be our best beloved companion and brother, and becomes a mysterious personage, inscrutable to our thought, and far removed from our sympathy.

We have gone somewhat fully into this discussion, which the secession of a brother and friend from our ranks has roused. He has called to us, with his familiar and eloquent voice, to follow him in accepting the doctrine of the Trinity. We can see no good reason for doing it. His own example and his evident sincerity are more moving arguments than his reasoning. We ask ourselves, May there not be something for us, too, in that doctrine in which he seems to have found so much good? But, then, we remember, that, while he has been struggling out of Unitarianism into Trinitarianism, others have been as earnestly and honestly struggling out of Trinitarianism into Unitarianism. Some Protestants turn Catholics, and find peace: some Catholics turn Protestants, and also find peace. We have seen converts from Calvinism to Universalism, from Universalism to Calvinism; converts from and to a liberal theology; all equally happy in their new faith. One conversion neutralizes another, as evidence for or against the truth of a system.

And now, in taking leave of our brother and of this discussion, we would reach out our hand to him across the dividing gulf of opinion, and say, "God bless you! We stood near you at your ordination, and sympathized with your emotions then in devoting yourself to the service of God. We have seen the manner of your life, — earnest, true, devoted. We are sad at this parting, but believe that you are not wholly taken from us in heart. A few years, brother, and we shall know all which we now see in a glass darkly. Meantime, let us remember the words of Melancthon: 'Hoc est Christum cognoscere, beneficia ejus cognoscere; non, ut illi aiunt, modos incarnationis.'"

Woman's Right to Labor; or, Low Wages and Hard Work. By Caroline H. Dall. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co.

We have been reading a little book lately offered to the public by Mrs. C. H. Dall, which evinces a large portion of that spirit which is willing to spend and be spent in the service of suffering humanity; evincing also a perhaps equally remarkable grasp of comprehension, clearness of intellectual perception, and literary ability. Let no one be repelled by its title, "Woman's Right to Labor;" for this is not a case of a woman pleading for her own rights, — always an ungraceful, though sometimes necessary proceeding, — except so far as she has made the rights and wrongs of others her own. In these lectures, no permission is asked for women of genius or culture to have room to work out their artistic or literary or executive tendencies. Such permission, if it ever were needed or sought, is so no longer. On all hands it is admitted that a woman may do "whatever perfect thing she can;" and, having done, may take her stand upon her work, and be judged by its quality as "mere work," not as "mere woman's work."

But the author's request is, that we should lend our ears, and peradventure a little of our hearts, while she details to us the results of her patient and laborious investigations in the dark places of life. She has heard, through all the superincumbent strata of society, the cry that comes from the deep below the lowest depth; she has gauged the wretchedness of the "perishing classes" in our large towns and cities; and now she relates her story, and proposes her remedies. She tells her sad tale with rare refinement and dignity of speech, with rare force and clearness also, and with so earnest and pure a purpose, that we feel its moral pressed upon us with resistless force. "I meant," she says in her preface, "to drive the reality of that wretchedness home. I wanted the women to whom I spoke to feel for those 'in bonds, as bound with them;' and to

understand, that to save their own children, male and female, they must be willing to save the children of others."

The first lecture is occupied chiefly with details of the evil and the want. The two last propose the cure and the supply. She finds that women, by hundreds and thousands (for every step of her progress is fortified by stubborn statistics), are perishing for lack of work, — work suited to their higher endowments, and yielding an adequate support for the physical life. She finds the first cause of the misery and degradation which she has explored, in the modern contempt for all work in general, and women's work in particular; and she shows that women can do, and have always done, various kinds of labor, usually thought above their powers of mind and body.

In the second and third lectures, many excellent practical suggestions are made as to new avenues of employment, and the institutions that might be opened, where needed work — work needed by worker and employed — might be done more profitably to the one and more cheaply to the other than in any that at present exist.

The author finds in society two perishing classes: the one at the top of society, perishing for lack of object in existence; perishing under the burden of unused powers and unemployed gifts. At the other extreme are those perishing in need of body, and more terrible need of soul; perishing for lack of instruction, of guidance and encouragement; perishing, in short, for want of that which the other class perishes from withholding. She would bridge over the impassable gulf between these two. She would bring down women from the high places of society, to see how women of like nature with themselves are living in this high noon of civilization, within reach of "Christian homes and hearts," and under the equal eye of the dear God who loves all souls alike, and confers no privilege without its corresponding responsibility. Then, by the instrumentality thus evoked, she would lift up the fallen to purity, to self-respect, to hope, and to self-sustaining and justly remunerative labor. There is no need, however, to give further details in regard to a book which is short enough for any one to read who is interested in the subject, and well written enough to repay perusal on the ground

of its mere literary excellence. One somewhat painful passage, beginning on the 111th page, may perhaps give the impression, that the author presents men and women as respective illustrations of the demonic and angelic type of being.

We need not, however, argue with her on the striking exceptions on both sides, which are not far to seek, as, in the following paragraphs, the mutual needs and co-operative forces of the sexes are finely stated; and we can only wish that this somewhat declamatory passage had been omitted altogether.

It will be the dawn of a better era for woman, when all woman's work shall be done as faithfully and ably as that of this little volume. The one thing abhorrent to all who have at heart the interests of any good cause, and have intellectual perception to see what is wanted, is slovenliness. No good purpose can be forwarded by bad work.

In closing, we can do no better than give the last passage from the book, so suggestive it is of the duty and responsibility which rest on all who shall read its statements, and who find in themselves and their surroundings the ability to carry out its proposed reformations: —

"Opportunity is a rare and sacred thing. God seldom offers it twice. In the English fields, the little drosera, or sun-dew, lifts its tiny crimson head. The delicate buds are clustered in a raceme; to the summit of which they climb, one by one. The topmost bud waits only through the twelve hours of a single day to open. If the sun do not shine, it withers and drops, and gives way to the next aspirant.

"So it is with the human heart and its purposes. If the sunshine of faith and the serene heaven of resolution meet the ripe hour, all is well; but if you faint, repel, delay, they wither at the core, and your crown is stolen from you, — your privilege set aside."

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

[We intend, hereafter, to notice at length only such books as ought to be noticed on account of our readers. Any books on matters of Christian theology or Christian life, which they will probably wish to know something of, we shall examine. All other books sent to this office will be mentioned by their titles in this list, with such brief remarks as their case may seem to require.]

A Narrative of the Discovery of Sir John Franklin and his Companions. By Capt. M'Clintock, R.N., LL.D. With Maps and Illustrations. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

A very interesting account of another heroic struggle to rescue, or to discover the fate of, suffering fellow-men. These narratives are good, as showing what man can do and bear in a good cause, from high motives.

Poems. By the Author of "A Life for a Life;" "John Halifax, Gentleman;" &c. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

We have met but two good poems in this volume, — "Two Hands upon the Breast;" and "Philip, my King." There may be others; but it is too much trouble to look for these few grains of wheat in bushels of chaff.

Seven Years. By Julia Kavanagh. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

Pure, good, innocent stories; not very interesting nor amusing: but, if people must read novels, these will not do them much harm.

Sermons on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. By the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, M.A. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

We hope to have an article, before long, on Modern Sermons, — illustrated by the recent books of Bellows, Huntington, Bartol, Robertson, and Beecher. We shall then return to this volume.

A Trip to Cuba. By Mrs. Julia Ward Howe. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

As witty and bright as is its author; who has flashed herself into her book, and made something as readable and agreeable as heart could wish, for the joy of a summer's day.

Self-Help; with Illustrations of Character and Conduct. By SAMUEL SMILES, Author of "The Life of George Stephenson."

> "This above all, — to thine own self be true;
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man."
>
> SHAKSPEARE.

Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

Anecdotes of men who have "achieved greatness." Suggestive, instructive, and with good motive-power on a not very high plane.

New Miscellanies. By CHARLES KINGSLEY, Rector of Eversley. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1860.

Kingsley is Kingsley here, as always.

Poems. By SIDNEY DOBELL. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1859.

Goethe says that "most modern poets put too much water in their ink." Mr. Dobell is no exception to this remark. Like most other recent poets, he has found it necessary to have a poem on the model of Faust. Manfred, Paracelsus, Festus, and we know not how many more, sing the same song of profound speculation united with reckless dissipation, — a sage and a *roué* rolled into one. Mr. Dobell follows suit with *Balder.*

Gotthold's Emblems; or, Invisible things understood by Things that are Made. By CHRISTIAN SCRIVER, Minister of Madeburg in 1671. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

Christ in History. By ROBERT TURNBULL, D.D. New and revised edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.

To be noticed hereafter.

The Still Hour; or, Communion with God. By AUSTIN PHELPS, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.

One of the books of which we can never have too many.

The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records stated anew, with Special Reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860.

Mr. Rawlinson has edited the new edition of Herodotus, — a noble work; to which he has added very learned Essays, containing all now known of Assyria, Babylonia, &c., from the cuneiform writings. This knowledge he has here applied to the defence of revelation.

The Limits of Religious Thought examined. By HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, B.D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

We shall give this book a more thorough notice hereafter. At present, we only say that it is a thoroughly conscientious and very able work, which deserves to be carefully read. It will not be without its influence on many minds; as its influence may be seen in the recent change of opinion of Prof. Huntington, who has plainly made the book a study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1860.			
Jan. 24.	From Society in Keene, N.H., for Mr. Gangooly, "to aid him in his studies, and establish him on his return"		$76.38
" "	From Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Clinton		6.00
" "	" a Friend in Brunswick, Me., for Monthly Journal		5.00
" 25.	" a Friend		5.00
" "	" Rev. Dr. Robbins's Society, Boston, as a donation		217.36
" "	From Rev. Dr. Bartol's Society, Boston, with the request that $60 of the amount be given to Rev. William A. Baldwin's Society, Fon du Lac, Wis.		172.64
" 27.	From Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Hingham		7.00
" 30.	" Society in Somerville, for Monthly Journals		24.00
" "	" " " Belfast, Me., " " "		30.00
" "	" " " North Chelsea, for " "		18.00
" 31.	" Walker, Wise, & Co., for Books		186.25
" "	" Rev. Dr. Newell's Society, Cambridge, as a donation		135.00
" "	" Society in Marlboro', for Monthly Journals		12.00
" "	" " " Belmont, " " " additional		2.00
" "	" " " Leominster, for " "		28.00
" "	" Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Sherborn		6.00
" "	" " " " " Barre		8.00
" "	" Rev. Dr. Bartol's Society, Boston, additional		10.00
" "	" scattered subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Jan'y		86.27
Feb. 2.	" Society in Fairhaven, for Monthly Journals		13.00
" "	From Rev. C. S. Locke, West Dedham, for Monthly Journals		10.00
" 4.	From Rev. Richard Pike's Society, Dorchester, for Monthly Journals		14.00
" 5.	From Rev. Fred. Frothingham's Society, Portland, Me., for Monthly Journals		31.00
" "	From Society in West Roxbury, for Monthly Journals		25.00
" "	" Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Lunenburg		9.00
" 7.	From Rev. Ed. J. Young's Society, Newton, for Monthly Journals		68.00

Feb. 7.	From Rev. A. B. Muzzey's Society, Newburyport, for Mr. Gangooly	$40.00		
	From the Sunday School	10.00		
				50.00
„ „	From Rev. Dr. Hill's Society, Worcester, for Mr. Gangooly			48.00
„ „	From Rev. R. R. Shippen's Society, Worcester, for Mr. Gangooly			33.00
„ „	From Society in Eastport, Me., for Monthly Journals			20.00
„ „	„ Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Brookfield			5.00
„ „	From a Lady, through Rev. Dr. Newell, for the Book Fund	$20.00		
	For general purposes	20.00		
	For Indian Mission	10.00		
				50.00
„ 8.	From Subscribers to Monthly Journal, at Staten Island, N.Y.			11.00
„ „	From Brunswick, Me., for Monthly Journals, additional			2.00
„ „	„ Portland, „ „ „ „			1.00
„ 9.	„ Rev. James Martineau, to balance his account			50.98
„ „	„ Dr. Newell's Society, Cambridge, additional			1.00
„ „	„ Society in Somerville, for Monthly Journals, add'l			4.00
„ „	„ „ „ West Cambridge, „ „			15.00
„ „	From Rev. Dr. Hall's Society, Providence, R.I., for Monthly Journals			65.00
„ „	From Chicopee, for Monthly Journals, additional			1.00
„ „	„ Society in Burlington, Vt., for Monthly Journals			15.00
„ 10.	„ Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Rockport, Ill.			8.00
„ 14.	„ „ „ „ „ „ Chicago, „			5.00
„ „	„ Society in Marblehead, for Monthly Journals			15.00
„ „	„ „ Ashby, „ „ „			10.36
„ „	„ the "Mite Society," Marblehead, as a donation			21.00
„ 15.	„ Society in Petersham, for Monthly Journals			27.00
„ „	„ Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Ware			3.00
„ „	„ Sherborn, for „ „ additional			1.00
„ „	From Mr. John McCarty, as first payment for the Van Polanen Chapel and lot in Bridgeport, Conn.			1700.00
„ 16.	From Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Marietta, O., additional			5.00
„ 17.	From Louisville, Ky., for Monthly Journals			50.00
„ „	From Mrs. S. M. Lawrence, Oswego, N.Y., for Indian Mission			10.00
„ 18.	From Society in Fitchburg, for Monthly Journals			58.00
„ „	„ „ „ Sterling, for Monthly Journals			45.00
„ „	From Hawes-place Society, South Boston, for Monthly Journals			18.00
„ „	From Rev. A. P. Putnam's Society, Roxbury, for Monthly Journals			54.00
„ „	From Rev. A. P. Putnam's Society, Roxbury, for Mr. Gangooly			66.00
„ 20.	From Subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Kingston			7.00
„ „	„ a Friend, for Indian Mission			5.00
„ 21.	„ Subscribers to Monthly Journals, in Sudbury			4.00
„ „	„ Society in Littleton, for Quarterly Journals			20.00
„ „	From Rev. A. Woodbury's Society, Providence, R.I., as a donation			92.00

CANDIDATES FOR SETTLEMENT.

This list will be corrected monthly. Brethren desiring their names entered, or address changed, will please indicate the same to the Secretary of the A. U. A.

The * affixed to the word "Boston" indicates the address, — "Unitarian Rooms, 245, Washington Street, Boston."

Preachers.	Address.
Horatio Alger	Marlborough.
Geo. Bradburn	Athol.
Caleb Davis Bradlee	North Cambridge.
H. W. Brown	Worcester.
Charles T. Canfield	Walpole, N.H.
C. A. Cutter	Cambridge.
F. C. Capen	Boston.*
William Cushing	Clinton.
Charles Brace Ferry	Boston.*
E. B. French	Holliston.
Gerald Fitzgerald	Boston.*
J. K. Hosmer	Cambridge.
William H. Knapp	Quincy.
Thomas S. Lathrop	Boston.*
J. F. Lovering	Boston.*
Richard Metcalf	Meadville, Pa.
Henry L. Myrick	West Cambridge.
George Osgood	Montague.
J. C. Parsons	Gloucester.
D. C. M. Potter	Mattapoisett.
J. Mills Peirce	Cambridge.
Thomas H. Pons	Boston.*
James Richardson	Groveland.
Edward Stone	Framingham.
E. Vitalis Scherb	Boston.*
George W. Stacy	Milford.
Edward C. Towne	New Haven, Conn.
Loammi G. Ware	Boston.*
Henry Wescott	Cambridge.
Daniel S. Whitney	Southborough.
J. B. Willard	Still River.
George A. Williams	Deerfield.
Samuel D. Worden	Lowell.
William C. Wyman	Brooklyn, N.Y.